

REMARKS

This application comprises claims 1-46. Claims 1, 24 and 28 are independent claims. Claim 24 has been currently amended and claims 28-46 have been currently added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27. The Applicant's response refers primarily to the independent claims rejected by the Examiner. The patentability of the dependent claims will follow at least for the reason of being dependent on an independent claim, which is patentable.

In paragraph 3 on page 2, the Examiner states that claims 1-3, 5-12, 17-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rabne et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,006,332.

The applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner has not shown a *prima facie* case of anticipation (MPEP §2143.03) since Rabne lacks elements of the claims. In claim 1 there is at least the limitation "transmitting the information from the data source to a server, wherein said information is in a format suitable for viewing by the client". In contrast in Rabne's Rights Management (RM) system the data source is the servers of the RM system. The original transmission from the server is encoded. The only way a client can access the information from the servers is via an RM compliant browser application supplied by the servers (col. 6 lines 53-55).

In paragraph 5 on page 4, the Examiner states that claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne further in view of Chaddha et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,621,660.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner has not shown a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP §2143.03) since Rabne and Chadda lack limitations of claim 4. As explained above Rabne lacks limitations of claim 1. Additionally Chadda describes extracting a video stream at different spatial and temporal resolutions (col. 3 lines 37-41). In Chadda the temporal resolutions do not hinder copying the information as required in the claim. Further additionally, Rabne has no reason (MPEP §2143.01) to temporally modulate the display of the information to hinder copying of the information, since Rabne requires the use of an RM compliant browser which already protects the information from being copied.

In paragraph 6 on page 5, the Examiner states that claims 13-16 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne further in view of Tso et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Regarding claims 13-14 the Examiner has not shown a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP §2143.01), since Rabne has no reason to modify some of the information supplied by the servers as required by the claims. Rabne describes delivering

content, recording its use and protecting it from being copied. As a result Rabne requires the use of the RM compliant browser supplied by the server, which controls the use of the information.

Regarding claims 15-16 and 24-27 the Examiner has not shown a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP §2143.01) since it is not clear how it is possible to combine a proxy as taught in Tso with Rabne and required by the claims. In Rabne, the information must first be cataloged. A client selects the content from the RM system catalogs and not from a web server which delivers the content using Rabne as a proxy.

In paragraph 7 on page 6, the Examiner states that claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne further in view of Gerace, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,735.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner has not shown a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP §2143.03) since Rabne and Gerace lack limitations of the claims. As explained above Rabne lacks limitations of claim 1, which are not described in Gerace. Additionally, Gerace describes preparing web pages with dynamic content based on user selection. Applicant does not see any support in Gerace for encoding content from a static object to a dynamic object to hinder copying as required in claim 21.

Claim 24 has been amended to fix a typographical error (the word "originally" was missing an "l").

Claims 28-46 have been added to further define the invention, as described for example on page 20 line 19-page 21 line 2, page 21 line 30-page 22 line 26 and page 24 line 6-page 24 line 32.

In view of the above comments and amendments, an allowance of all the claims is respectfully awaited.

If the Examiner is unable to agree that the claims are all patentable, he is respectfully requested to contact Maier Fenster at toll free 1 (877) 428-5468. This number connects directly to our office in Israel. Please note that Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington and that our work week is Sunday-Thursday.

Respectfully submitted,
E. MARMOR



Maier Fenster
Reg. No. 41,016

April 26, 2004
William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650